



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
933,224	8/14/78	Donald Samuel Kaplan	- 27361

Charles F. Costello, Jr.
1937 West Main Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06904

EXAMINER	
C. F. Rosenbaum	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
335	6

DATE MAILED:

MAILED

OCT 19 1979

CLERICAL BRANCH
GROUP 330

This action is made final.

This application has been examined. Responsive to communication filed on 9/24/79

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited, Form PTO-892. 2. Notice of Informal Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. 4.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 8 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims 6 are allowed.

4. Claims 1-5 AND 7-8 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. The formal drawings filed on _____ are acceptable.

8. The drawing correction request filed on _____ has been approved. disapproved.

9. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has
 been received. not been received. been filed in parent application, serial no. _____,
filed on _____.

10. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

11. Other

53

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Buck et al. cited herein. Buck et al. are silent as to the total molecular weight of polyether-ester composition however, the total weight could be adjusted as a matter of choice by selecting the amount of reactants (page 47). The amount (% wt.) of the "hard" segments in Buck et al. appear to be within the values claimed (Fig. 4, Fig. 5 & Fig. 6). Buck et al. illustrates 4-carbon radicals in the "hard" segments.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Buck et al., as applied above. It would be obvious to enclose the filaments of Buck et al. in a sterile enclosure merely as a matter of choice or design.

Claim 6 would be allowed if written in independent form.

Applicant's prior art statement is appreciated. Applicant's remarks with regard to Okazaki are well taken.

C. F. Rosenbaum/mb

703/557/3144

10/17/79

C. F. Rosenbaum

54